

REMARKS

Claims 25-37 and 52-65 remain in the present application. Claims 38-51 are cancelled herein. Claims 25 and 52 are amended herein. Applicants respectfully submit that no new matter has been added as a result of the claim amendments. Applicants respectfully request further examination and reconsideration of the rejections based on the arguments set forth below.

Examiner Interview Summary

A telephonic Examiner Interview was conducted on December 11, 2009 between Examiners Charles Hicks and Will Boddie and Applicants' representative Bryan M. Failing. Claims 25, 38 and 52 were discussed. With regard to Claim 25, it was agreed during the Examiner Interview that the cited references of record fail to teach or suggest a first pixel of a first display screen including a first plurality of sub-pixels arranged in a first pattern, a second pixel of a second display screen including a second plurality of sub-pixels arranged in a second pattern, and where the first and second display screens overlap. With regard to Claim 52, it was also agreed during the Examiner Interview that the cited references of record fail to teach or suggest the combination of elements including "wherein said first display screen utilizes a first display technology," "wherein said second display screen utilizes a second display technology" and "wherein said second display technology is different from said first display technology" as recited in independent Claim 52. No agreement was reached with regard to Claim 38. Applicants thank the Examiners for conducting the interview.

Claim Rejections – 35 U.S.C. §102

Claims 52-60 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. §102(e) as being allegedly anticipated by United States Patent Number 6,906,762 to Witehira et al. (referred to herein as “Witehira”). It was agreed during the Examiner Interview on December 11, 2009 that the cited references of record fail to teach or suggest the combination of elements including “wherein said first display screen utilizes a first display technology,” “wherein said second display screen utilizes a second display technology” and “wherein said second display technology is different from said first display technology” as recited in independent Claim 52. Accordingly, Applicants respectfully submit that Claims 52-60 overcome the 35 U.S.C. §102(e) rejection of record, and therefore, are allowable.

Claim Rejections – 35 U.S.C. §103

Claims 25-33

Claims 25-33 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. §103(a) as being allegedly unpatentable over Witehira. It was agreed during the Examiner Interview on December 11, 2009 that the cited references of record fail to teach or suggest a first pixel of a first display screen including a first plurality of sub-pixels arranged in a first pattern, a second pixel of a second display screen including a second plurality of sub-pixels arranged in a second pattern, and where the first and second display screens overlap. Accordingly, Applicants respectfully submit that the cited references of record also fail to teach or suggest the combination of elements of “a first display screen comprising a first plurality of pixels,” “wherein a

first pixel of said first plurality of pixels comprises a first plurality of sub-pixels arranged in a first pattern,” “a second display screen comprising a second plurality of pixels,” “wherein a second pixel of said second plurality of pixels comprises a second plurality of sub-pixels arranged in a second pattern” and “wherein said second pattern is different from said first pattern” as recited in independent Claim 25. As such, Applicants respectfully submit that independent Claim 25 is not rendered obvious by Witehira. Since Claims 26-33 recite further elements of the invention claimed in independent Claim 25, Applicants respectfully submit that Claims 26-33 are also not rendered obvious by Witehira. Thus, Applicants respectfully submit that Claims 25-33 overcome the 35 U.S.C. §103(e) rejection of record, and therefore, are allowable.

Claims 62-63

Claims 62-63 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. §103(a) as being allegedly unpatentable over Witehira. Since Claims 62-63 recite further elements of the invention claimed in independent Claim 52, Applicants respectfully submit that Claims 62-63 are not rendered obvious by Witehira. Thus, Applicants respectfully submit that Claims 62-63 overcome the 35 U.S.C. §103(e) rejection of record, and therefore, are allowable.

Claims 34-36, 61 and 64

Claims 34-36, 61 and 64 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. §103(a) as being allegedly unpatentable over Witehira in view of United States Patent Number 7,072,095 to Liang et al. (referred to herein as “Liang ‘095”). Since Claims 34-

36, 61 and 64 recite further elements of the invention claimed in their respective independent Claims, Applicants respectfully submit that Claims 34-36, 61 and 64 are not rendered obvious by Witehira in view of Liang '095. Thus, Applicants respectfully submit that Claims 34-36, 61 and 64 overcome the 35 U.S.C. §103(e) rejection of record, and therefore, are allowable.

Claims 37-46, 48-49, 51 and 65

Claims 37-46, 48-49, 51 and 65 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. §103(a) as being allegedly unpatentable over Witehira in view of United States Patent Number 6,573,961 to Jiang et al. (referred to herein as "Jiang"). Claims 38-46, 48-49 and 51 are cancelled herein, and thus, Applicants respectfully submit that a discussion of the 35 U.S.C. §103(a) rejection of Claims 38-46, 48-49 and 51 is moot. Since Claims 37 and 65 recite further elements of the invention claimed in their respective independent Claims, Applicants respectfully submit that Claims 37 and 65 are not rendered obvious by Witehira in view of Jiang. Thus, Applicants respectfully submit that Claims 37 and 65 overcome the 35 U.S.C. §103(e) rejection of record, and therefore, are allowable.

Claims 47 and 50

Claims 47 and 50 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. §103(a) as being allegedly unpatentable over Witehira in view of Jiang and further in view of Liang '095. Claims 47 and 50 are cancelled herein, and thus, Applicants respectfully submit that a discussion of the 35 U.S.C. §103(a) rejection of Claims 47 and 50 is moot.

General Remarks

The additional limitations recited in the independent claims or dependent claims are not further discussed as the above-discussed limitations are believed to be sufficient to distinguish the claimed invention from the prior art of record. However, Applicants respectfully reserve the right to respond to one or more of the Examiner's rejections in subsequent amendments should conditions arise warranting such responses.

CONCLUSION

Applicants respectfully submit that Claims 25-37 and 52-65 are in condition for allowance and Applicants earnestly solicit such action from the Examiner.

The Examiner is urged to contact Applicants' undersigned representative if the Examiner believes such action would expedite resolution of the present application.

Please charge any additional fees or apply any credits to our PTO deposit account number: 50-4160.

Respectfully submitted,

MURABITO, HAO & BARNES LLP

Dated: 3 / 30 / 2010

/BMF/

Bryan M. Failing
Registration No. 57,974

Two North Market Street
Third Floor
San Jose, CA 95113
(408) 938-9060